

# **Part IV – Representations and Instructions**

## **SECTION M**

### **EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>M.1</b>	<b>52.217-5 Evaluation of Options. (JUL 1990)</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>M.2</b>	<b>ORO M03 Qualification Criteria (MAY 1997)</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>M.3</b>	<b>ORO M05 Evaluation Criteria (Alternate I) (MAY 1997)</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>M.4</b>	<b>Evaluation of Proposals (June 2004)</b>	<b>5</b>

## SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

### M.1 52.217-5 Evaluation of Options. (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

### M.2 ORO M03 Qualification Criteria (MAY 1997)

- (a) The proposal must clearly demonstrate that the Offeror meets the following Qualification Criteria in order to be evaluated in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria. Proposals failing to meet the following qualification requirement will not be evaluated:

#### Qualification Criteria:

Offerors must demonstrate \$3 million total annually, generated by no more than three (3) awards, performed within the last three (3) years for a period of at least one year per award.

- (b) Proposals that have met the Qualification Criteria will be evaluated in accordance with applicable DOE and Federal acquisition policies and procedures.

### M.3 ORO M05 Evaluation Criteria (Alternate I) (MAY 1997)

Technical and Business Management Criteria. Technical aspects of proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

#### Criterion 1 – Technical Approach (300 points)

The feasibility and efficiency of the Offeror's overall technical approach to support the IT environment and requirements identified within the PWS will be evaluated. The degree to which the Offeror's section by section response to the PWS demonstrates technical understanding of the specific tasks to be performed will be evaluated. The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed mix of labor categories and technical approach:

- maximizes system availability;
- enhances response times;
- minimizes end user disruption;
- leads to the overall successful performance of the PWS;
- demonstrates how technical proficiency will be maintained;
- describes specific performance responsibilities; and
- identifies automated tools to be used for operation; and
- provides smooth and efficient interactions with customer support staff and end users.

**Criterion 2 – Key Personnel and Resource Availability (200 points)****A. Key Personnel (150 Points)**

Key personnel will be evaluated for their experience, technical background, availability, and overall qualifications applicable to the position for which they are proposed.

**B. Resource Availability (50 Points)**

Experience/qualification of those employees whom the Offeror may access to fulfill the stated position requirements ([Section L](#), [Attachments VI](#) and [VII](#)) will be evaluated. The degree to which the Offeror addresses the Offeror's ability to access additional resources including the leveraging of corporate resources which are to be utilized or made available if required in support of this PWS will be evaluated.

**Criterion 3 – Corporate Experience and Past Performance (200 points)****A. Corporate Experience (150 points)**

The Offeror and any teaming partners, subcontractor, or joint venture company will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that prior experience has prepared the Offeror, teaming partner, subcontractor, or joint venture company to efficiently and effectively accomplish those PWS requirements for which they are proposed to perform.

**B. Past Performance (50 points)**

The Offeror, and any teaming partner, subcontractor, or joint venture company will be evaluated on the basis of past performance information furnished by customers on recent contracts similar to the PWS in contract type, duration, scope, complexity, and dollar value. The Past Performance Evaluations (see RFP, [Section L](#), [Attachment IX](#)) will be used to collect information. However, the Government may consider information in other forms, and from any source, and may conduct evaluations based on any number of returned Past Performance Evaluations. DOE may use additional past performance information obtained from available Federal Government electronic databases, as well as other sources. When no past performance information is received from the Offeror's references or obtained from other Federal sources, Offerors will be given a past performance rating that is neither favorable nor unfavorable. The Government has no obligation to contact any or all of the references.

**Criterion 4 – Business Management and Operating Plans (300 points)****A. Transition Plan (100 points)**

The proposed Transition Plan will be evaluated to determine the ability, feasibility and credibility of the plan and how the Offeror will: minimize the duration of the transition (from predecessor to Offeror); minimize the disruption of end user services; provide a smooth transition to the successful Offeror; and make the change in contractor transparent to the customer base.

**B. Business Plan (200 points)**

The proposed Business Plan will be evaluated to determine the ability, feasibility and credibility of the plan and how the Offeror will: Utilize structure and interrelationships among teaming partners, subcontractors, or joint venture company, the customer, and end users to achieve seamless integration, responsiveness, and overall successful performance of the work; maintain or improve quality and timeliness of services; implement best business practices; adapt to expected reductions in the level of support and performance based services required during the five year period of this agreement; respond to fluctuating peak workloads and accelerated service requests; meet the PWS performance standards; and adapt to a changing IT environment.

**Best Value Selection**

Price will neither be point scored nor adjectively rated, but will be evaluated for consistency with the technical proposal and will be used in determining which proposal represents the best value to the Government. Price will be reviewed to determine reasonableness, realism and completeness. The offeror's willingness to risk profit on performance in terms of amount of base fee proposed, if any, will also be considered. Price is considered to be significantly less important than the technical and business management factors.

The proposals will be evaluated to determine if the Offeror demonstrates a thorough understanding of, and capability to successfully accomplish, the requirements of the PWS. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the RFP and is determined to be the best value and most advantageous to the Government. Selection of the best value will be achieved through a process of evaluating and comparing proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria and proposed price. To determine the best value to the Government, a trade-off analysis between the technical merit of the proposal and price may be performed. A best value decision reflects the Government's willingness to accept other than the lowest price if the perceived benefits of the offer with the higher price merits the increase.

**M.4 Evaluation of Proposals (June 2004)**

- (a) This acquisition will be conducted pursuant to the policies and procedures in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 and Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) Part 915. DOE has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate the proposals submitted for this acquisition.
- (b) The instructions set forth in [Section L](#) are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the documentation that will be evaluated by the SEB. The Offeror must furnish adequate and specific information in its response. Cursory responses or responses which merely repeat or reformulate the PWS are not acceptable.
- (c) A proposal will be eliminated from further consideration before the initial ratings if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. For example, a proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable initial effort to address itself to the essential requirements of the RFP, or if it clearly demonstrates that the Offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP.

In the event that a proposal is rejected, a notice will be sent to the Offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.

- (d) Prior to an award, a determination shall be made by the Source Selection Authority whether any possible Organizational Conflict of Interest exists with respect to the apparent successful Offeror or whether there is little or no likelihood that such conflict exists. In making this determination, DOE will consider the representation required by [Section K](#) of this solicitation. An award will be made if there is no Organizational Conflict of Interest or if any potential Organizational Conflict of Interest can be appropriately avoided or mitigated.
- (e) The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms for both a technical and cost standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.
- (f) For the purpose of evaluating information on an Offeror's past experience and past performance, an Offeror shall be defined as those companies which have established business arrangements or relationships for this solicitation, including subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the PWS. DOE may contact some or all of the references provided by the Offeror, and may solicit past performance information from other available sources.
- (g) Exceptions or deviations to any terms and conditions alone will not render the proposal unacceptable; however, any exceptions or deviations to the terms of the solicitation may make the offer unacceptable for award without discussions. If an Offeror proposes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the contract, the Government may make an award without discussions to another Offeror that did not take exception to the terms and conditions of the solicitation.
- (h) Pursuant to 15.306(c), the Contracting Officer's determination of competitive range for proposals submitted as a result of this solicitation will consider such factors as the most highly rated proposals, initial cost/price proposed and other items set forth in this section. Offerors are hereby advised that only those proposals deemed to have a reasonable chance for award of a contract will be included in the competitive range. Offerors who are not included in the competitive range will be promptly notified.
- (i) An overall rating of unsatisfactory in one evaluation criterion may result in elimination of the proposal from further consideration regardless of the rating of the other criteria or subcriteria. An overall criterion rating of unacceptable may result from one subcriterion within a criterion being rated unacceptable, or from more than one subcriteria within a criterion being rated poor.